

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Eva Vaillancourt	Team: Team # 4	CCRB Case #: 201304248	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Wednesday, 05/15/2013 11:59 PM	Location of Incident: Inside the 42nd Precinct stationhouse	Precinct: 42	18 Mo. SOL 11/15/2014	EO SOL 11/15/2014	
Date/Time CV Reported Fri, 05/17/2013 3:56 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Fri, 05/17/2013 3:56 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Witness(es)	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. An officer			
2. POM Mauricio Thomas	26957	945466	042 PCT
3. POF Glendale Pluas	05881	928974	042 PCT
4. POM Alverny Tavarez	04865	948142	042 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. SGT Raymond Clarke	00498	918856	042 PCT
2. SGT Fidel Rosario	02850	943759	042 PCT
3. LSA David Vasquez	00000	916845	042 PCT
4. POF Leslie Rosa	25255	935646	042 PCT
5. SGT Franny Nunez	03473	933105	TB DT11

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Mauricio Thomas	Force: PO Mauricio Thomas used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
B.POM Alverny Tavarez	Force: PO Alverny Tavarez used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
C.POF Glendale Pluas	Force: PO Glendale Pluas used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
D.POM Mauricio Thomas	Force: PO Mauricio Thomas struck § 87(2)(b) with an asp.	
E. An officer	Force: An officer used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	

Case Summary

On May 17, 2013, § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint with the CCRB by phone. On May 15, 2013, § 87(2)(b) was arrested by PO Mauricio Thomas and brought to the 42nd Precinct stationhouse in the Bronx. The following allegations resulted:

- **Allegation A – Force: PO Mauricio Thomas used physical force against § 87(2)(b)**
- **Allegation B – Force: PO Alverny Tavaréz used physical force against § 87(2)(b)**
- **Allegation C – Force: PO Glendale Pluas used physical force against § 87(2)(b)**

§ 87(2)(g)

- **Allegation D – Force: PO Mauricio Thomas struck § 87(2)(b) with an asp.**

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

- **Allegation E – Force: An officer used physical force against § 87(2)(b)**

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

Civilian Statement

Complainant/Victim: § 87(2)(b)

- § 87(2)(b) is a § 87(2)(b).

Arrest Photograph

In the photograph taken of § 87(2)(b) pursuant to her arrest on § 87(2)(b), no scratches, cuts, or bruises can be seen (encl. B3).

CCRB Statement

§ 87(2)(b) provided a phone statement to the CCRB on May 17, 2013, and was interviewed at the

CCRB in person on June 26, 2013 (encl.B1-10). Her statements are integrated and summarized below, and all relevant inconsistencies have been noted.

On May 15, 2013, at approximately 9:00 p.m., § 87(2)(b) was arrested inside a store at 1464

Bryant Avenue, in the Bronx, for reasons she did not, at that time, understand. PO1, a white male officer with red hair and a white uniform shirt, approached her and asked, “Are you § 87(2)(b) When § 87(2)(b) said yes, PO1 grabbed § 87(2)(b)’s hands, pulled them behind her back, and placed her in handcuffs. § 87(2)(b)’s cousin, § 87(2)(b) and nephew, § 87(2)(b) were also arrested outside the location. § 87(2)(b) was then placed in a vehicle and transported to the 42nd Precinct stationhouse by three male officers, one of whom, identified by the investigation as PO Mauricio Thomas, told § 87(2)(b) that he was her arresting officer. PO Thomas, described as a dark-skinned Dominican male in his thirties who was 5’9” tall, of medium build, and dressed in uniform, was seated in the backseat with § 87(2)(b). Also in the vehicle was a uniformed Hispanic male with black hair,

identified by the investigation as PO Alverny Tavarez. PO Tavarez was described as being about 5'7" tall and 150 or 160 pounds, with a muscular build. He appeared to be about 30 years old, and had glasses with black frames. PO2, also in the car, was a Hispanic male with a medium complexion.

At the stationhouse, § 87(2)(b) repeatedly asked various officers to explain why she had been arrested. When no one would tell her, § 87(2)(b) informed the officers that she refused to be fingerprinted. PO Thomas then told § 87(2)(b) that she had been arrested for a knife that was found inside her friend's car. When § 87(2)(b) still refused to be fingerprinted, PO Thomas shackled her hands in front of her, shackled her legs, and placed her in a holding cell. There was no one else in the holding cell with § 87(2)(b) and two others were in the adjacent men's holding cell, from which there is no direct line of sight into the women's area.

It was inside the holding cell that PO Thomas first instructed § 87(2)(b) to forfeit her jewelry, in preparation for her transfer to Central Booking. § 87(2)(b) was wearing a set of bracelets, ankle-bracelets, earrings, a necklace, and a thumb-ring. § 87(2)(b) informed PO Thomas that she would not remove her jewelry, and would not comply with any of his directives. PO Thomas then became upset and left the holding cell, saying he would get female officers to remove the jewelry. A short time later, he returned with two female officers, one of whom the investigation identified as PO Glendale Pluas. PO Pluas was described as a heavyset, medium-complexioned Hispanic female in uniform. Her dark-brown hair was pulled back in a ponytail. She looked to be in her thirties, was 170 to 180 pounds, and was 5'7" tall. In her initial statement to the CCRB, § 87(2)(b) stated that the other female, PO3, was a skinny white woman with blondish hair, shorter than 5'7" tall. In her official interview, § 87(2)(b) described PO3 as a short and skinny Hispanic woman who was older and a little darker than PO Pluas. PO3 had black hair and was dressed in uniform. She was in her forties, 5'5" tall, and 120 pounds.

As soon as the three officers entered, § 87(2)(b) sitting on a bench against the cell-wall, held her shackled arms to her chest and bent over, ducking her head down to her knees. PO Pluas told § 87(2)(b) to remove her jewelry two or three times, and § 87(2)(b) still bent over, said no. In her official CCRB interview, § 87(2)(b) said that the officers then began to hit her on the back. She felt herself being hit with multiple fists somewhere between five and ten times. § 87(2)(b) was kicked on her legs and back by PO Thomas and PO3, though § 87(2)(b) could not explain how she saw this with her head inclined to her knees. PO3 was pulling § 87(2)(b)'s jewelry off while the other officers continued to hit and "pull on" § 87(2)(b) who struggled to maintain her curled-up position. When PO Pluas grabbed § 87(2)(b)'s hair and forced her head up, § 87(2)(b) was able to see more officers clustered around her than the three she had initially observed, including PO Tavarez. She saw PO Tavarez kick her on her back. She also saw PO Thomas holding an asp. PO Thomas then hit § 87(2)(b) on the back with the asp, once or twice, and she fell to the floor. Once on the floor, § 87(2)(b) went limp and allowed the officers to remove the last piece of jewelry, her ankle-bracelet. § 87(2)(b) initially stated that PO2 was among the officers who hit her in the holding cell, but later retracted that statement.

In her initial phone statement to the CCRB, § 87(2)(b) described the force the officers used by saying, "I asked them several times to stop touching me, and they wouldn't stop touching me... They were just pulling on me, they were just grabbing me, pulling on me, and then they were like grabbing me forcefully, they were like twisting my hand, they were bruising me and my hand, they gave me several scratches and stuff like that." She then added that PO Pluas and PO3 "hit" her. She said she was thrown to the ground, where PO Thomas held her down and pulled her hair. In that statement, § 87(2)(b) never mentioned having been hit with an asp.

§ 87(2)(b) said that she incurred scratches on her wrist and bruising on her back, legs, and arms, as well as marks on her face § 87(2)(b) did not know who had hit her in the face, or when). She did not seek any medical treatment for her injuries. She remained in the holding cell for several hours before being removed to Central Booking. No other prisoners were placed in the cell with her in that time. She

was charged with possession of a controlled substance and with criminal possession of a weapon (switchblade).

§ 87(2)(b) alleged that, since the incident, she has been harassed by several of the officers involved; on May 17, 2013, she was stopped in her car by PO Tavarez. She chose to have that complaint referred to IAB, as part of a pattern of harassment. She also stated that she never received a voucher for her jewelry, and that it was never returned to her

Attempts to Schedule a Photo Viewing

Between July 19, 2013, and March 31, 2014, the investigator made a total of fourteen calls to seven numbers which were, at one time or another, associated with § 87(2)(b) in an attempt to schedule a photo viewing. The investigator sent a letter to the address she provided, which was returned by the U.S. Postal Service as “Not Known,” as well as an email to the address she provided, which received no reply. On March 31, 2014, § 87(2)(b) called the investigator and provided a new address and two new phone numbers. She agreed to come to the CCRB to view photographs of officers on April 7, 2014. § 87(2)(b) did not appear for that appointment, and did not call to cancel or reschedule. She did not reply when the investigator called her preferred number on April 8, 2014, and the investigator was unable to leave a message. When the investigator called that number again, on May 5, 2014, it had gone out of service. On that day, the investigator sent a letter to the new address § 87(2)(b) provided, as well as an email. The investigator called § 87(2)(b)'s back-up number on May 5, 2014, and May 16, 2014, reaching her uncle on both occasions. He had not seen § 87(2)(b) and did not know how to reach her. He stated that the address § 87(2)(b) provided to the investigator was his own, and that she did not live there. To date, § 87(2)(b) has not contacted the investigator.

Witnesses: § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b)

- § 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)

Telephone Statements

The investigator contacted § 87(2)(b) by phone on July 31, 2013 (encl. B11-12). He provided a telephone statement, in which he made several allegations of Abuse of Authority at the scene of his arrest on May 15, 2013. He also stated that, from the males' holding cell in the 42nd Precinct stationhouse, he was able to observe a black male officer, PO1, (5'9" tall, 180-185 pounds, slight goatee) instruct § 87(2)(b) to remove her jewelry. When § 87(2)(b) refused to do so, § 87(2)(b) saw PO1, two Hispanic female officers (both light-skinned, both between 145 and 150 pounds, both about 5'5" tall, both wearing their hair in ponytails, both dressed in gray tee-shirts and uniform pants; one, PO2, had brown hair while the other, PO3, had black hair), and a Hispanic male, PO4 (5'9" tall, 180 to 200 pounds, dressed in uniform and not wearing glasses; he had not been at the scene of the arrests), beat § 87(2)(b) while she was rear-cuffed and lying face-down on the ground inside the women's holding cell. PO2 hit § 87(2)(b) on the back while PO3 held her legs. PO1 stood outside the cell and told everyone to be quiet. § 87(2)(b) could not say what PO1 and PO4 did to “assault” § 87(2)(b) beyond holding her down by the handcuffs. § 87(2)(b) acknowledged that there is a solid wall between the male and female holding cells, but said that he could observe what was happening by angling his neck as he looked through the cell door.

§ 87(2)(b) agreed to be interviewed at the CCRB on August 7, 2013, at which time he intended to open his own investigation into the officer's Abuse of Authority at Bryant Avenue. § 87(2)(b) did not appear, and did not call to cancel or reschedule. The investigator was able to contact § 87(2)(b) by phone again on October 4, 2013, and scheduled him for a second appointment on October 8, 2013. He

did not appear, and did not call to cancel or reschedule. A review of the NYPD Booking and Complaint system confirmed that § 87(2)(b) was not arrested between October 4, 2013 and October 8, 2013. Because he failed to appear for two scheduled appointments and did not call to cancel or reschedule, § 87(2)(b)'s allegations were not pled.

The investigator contacted § 87(2)(b) by phone on August 5, 2013 (encl. B13). He acknowledged that he was arrested for “drugs and a knife” on May 15, 2013, but initially said he knew nothing about an incident later in the stationhouse, and nothing about an altercation his aunt, § 87(2)(b) had with officers in the holding cell. § 87(2)(b) gave a brief account of what occurred at Bryant Avenue, but stated that he did not want to make a complaint in regards. The investigator then asked him once more if anything unusual happened at the 42nd Precinct stationhouse. § 87(2)(b) replied, “Well, they did beat § 87(2)(b) up. Grabbing her because she had jewelry on.” § 87(2)(b) heard § 87(2)(b) screaming but saw nothing of what happened to her, because there is no way to see into the women’s holding cell from the men’s. He never observed any injuries on § 87(2)(b).

NYPD Statements

Subject Officer: PO MAURICIO THOMAS

- PO Thomas is a § 87(2)(b).
- On May 15, 2013, PO Thomas worked from 6:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m., assigned to Conditions with PO Alverny Tavarez and Sgt. David Vasquez. He was dressed in uniform and worked in unmarked vehicle #618.

Memo Book

At 9:15 p.m. on May 15, 2013, PO Thomas noted § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) He also issued summons § 87(2)(b). He prepared the arrest paperwork at 10:00 p.m. § 87(2)(b)'s complaint number was § 87(2)(b). PO Thomas noted her property clerk invoice #§ 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b). He noted a switchblade knife, an insulated snack jar containing PCP, jewelry, and general property. PO Thomas dropped off the arrest paperwork at the courthouse at 2:00 a.m., and returned to his station at 2:30 a.m. At 3:55 a.m., he was waiting for a vehicle to pick up. He was end of tour at 4:35 a.m.

Arrest Reports

As per three arrest reports prepared by PO Mauricio Thomas on May 15, 2013, § 87(2)(b) was arrested outside of § 87(2)(b) (encl. D38-46). Her physical condition is listed as “unknown.” § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were also arrested for § 87(2)(b). They are both described as being “intoxicated” on hallucinogenic drugs.

Property Vouchers

As per the property vouchers entered by PO Thomas, § 87(2)(b) was in possession of two earrings, four bracelets, one ring, one necklace, and one switchblade (encl. D1-4).

CCRB Statement

PO Mauricio Thomas was interviewed at the CCRB on November 6, 2013 (encl. C6-8). His statement is summarized below.

PO Thomas had never interacted with § 87(2)(b) before, and had no knowledge of her past criminal history, when he arrested her for possession of PCP on May 15, 2013. On that day, at 9:15 p.m., PO Thomas and PO Tavarez entered a store at 1473 Bryant Avenue in the Bronx to apprehend § 87(2)(b). PO Thomas did not know whether it was he or his partner who handcuffed her there. At the time of her arrest, § 87(2)(b) was very hostile and agitated, cursing and screaming at PO Thomas. She did not, however, do anything physically to prevent herself from being arrested. § 87(2)(b)'s hostile, aggressive, and voluble manner led PO Thomas to suspect she was high on PCP. While § 87(2)(b) was being apprehended inside the store, Lt. Vasquez was outside dealing with the two other arrestees, § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) at their vehicle. PO Tavarez does not wear glasses. PO Thomas, PO Tavarez, and Lt. Vasquez drove § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) back to the 42nd Precinct stationhouse in an unmarked vehicle, while § 87(2)(b) was driven there in a marked sector car by officers PO Thomas could not name or describe.

Given that he began processing § 87(2)(b)'s arrest paperwork at 10:00 p.m., PO Thomas thought he likely arrived at the 42nd Precinct stationhouse at about 9:40 p.m. or 9:45 p.m. PO Thomas saw § 87(2)(b) be taken into the stationhouse, as he arrived at more or less the same time the officers who brought her there did. § 87(2)(b) was then placed in a cell to await processing.

The cell area is visible from the desk, and the desk officer would have had the ability to see into § 87(2)(b)'s cell; the fingerprinting machine is right outside the cells, and is also in view of the desk. PO Thomas's interactions with § 87(2)(b) at the stationhouse did not begin until he tried to fingerprint her (neither Lt. Vasquez nor PO Tavarez was with him when he did; PO Thomas did not recall who the desk officer was). At that time, § 87(2)(b) was screaming at PO Thomas, calling him "stupid," "ignorant," and telling him he should go back to school. § 87(2)(b) was also screaming from her holding cell to § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) in the cell next door; she accused PO Thomas of having hit her, and said that they were all going to get money because of it. § 87(2)(b) also said she would call IAB. § 87(2)(b) continued talking, insisting that she did not know why she had been arrested, while PO Thomas fingerprinted the other two males. § 87(2)(b) was so hostile that, rather than even enter the cell, PO Thomas decided to have a female officer, PO Glendale Pluas, fingerprint her. PO Pluas was on meal at the time, but nevertheless approached § 87(2)(b) in the holding cell to try and persuade her to cooperate with a fingerprinting. PO Thomas was on-hand to witness that interaction. PO Pluas asked § 87(2)(b) who was not handcuffed, to step out of the holding cell. § 87(2)(b) complied, but continued shouting and verbally refused to be fingerprinted. PO Pluas did not have to make any physical contact with § 87(2)(b) to remove her from the cell. PO Pluas tried to calm § 87(2)(b) down in front of the fingerprinting machine, talking to her and explaining why she needed to comply with processing. Eventually, § 87(2)(b) agreed to be fingerprinted, though she continued to curse and shout. PO Pluas was able to complete the fingerprinting, and § 87(2)(b) was then returned to the cell. No other officer assisted PO Pluas in doing this. § 87(2)(b) was never handcuffed in the holding cell; the only reason a prisoner would be handcuffed in the holding cell is if this prisoner was threatening to harm themselves.

PO Thomas had only very limited interaction with § 87(2)(b) after fingerprinting. PO Thomas has not seen § 87(2)(b) since other officers transported her to Central Booking. The only time PO Thomas entered § 87(2)(b)'s cell was to give her a receipt for her property. He did not recall her wearing any jewelry at that point.

PO Thomas remembered § 87(2)(b) wearing many rings, two chains, and a watch. He had no memory of § 87(2)(b) refusing to forfeit her jewelry, nor did he ever hear that she had done so. PO Thomas could not recall who took § 87(2)(b)'s jewelry from her, but was sure that it was not

PO Plas. PO Thomas said that a female officer would usually be asked to search a female prisoner and voucher her property. That female officer would ask the prisoner to remove her jewelry and place it in a plastic envelope or bucket. All this happens in front of the desk, before the prisoner is fingerprinted. PO Thomas could not recall if he witnessed § 87(2)(b)'s jewelry being taken from her.

Prisoners may not be sent to Central Booking with any significant amount of jewelry. When prisoners are not compliant in forfeiting their jewelry, what happens next often depends on the demeanor of the prisoner herself. If a prisoner is very hostile and likely to hurt themselves or others, "then we have to do what needs to be done." PO Thomas explained that police officers will physically and forcibly remove jewelry in those cases. Other officers would typically be called to assist, but a supervisor would not necessarily have to be notified in regards. Any forcible removal of property would occur inside the cells.

PO Thomas never tried to remove § 87(2)(b) from the holding cell. When a female prisoner is behaving as belligerently as § 87(2)(b) was, it is PO Thomas's practice not to engage them. PO Thomas never used force against § 87(2)(b) and never had to make physical contact with her in the course of her arrest processing. He never hit her or kicked her, and never saw any other officer do so. PO Thomas never had to take out his asp. He never hit her with an asp, and never saw another officer do so. PO Thomas never heard of § 87(2)(b) having offered resistance to other officers at any point.

Subject Officer: PO ALVERNY TAVAREZ

- *PO Alverny Tavarez is a § 87(2)(b).*
- *PO Tavarez was working a conditions assignment from 6:00 p.m. on May 15, 2013, to 2:35 a.m. on May 16, 2013 (he later clarified that he left work at 12:05 in the morning). He was working with PO Mauricio Thomas and Lt. David Vasquez, was dressed in uniform, and was assigned to an unmarked motor vehicle he could not identify or describe.*

Memo Books

At 9:15 p.m. On May 15, 2013, PO Tavarez noted that three individuals were placed under arrest in front of 1473 Bryant Avenue, in regards to a car stop by PO Thomas (encl. C31). Lt. Vasquez was on scene, and contraband was recovered. PO Tavarez left the command at 12:00 a.m.

CCRB Statements

PO Alverny Tavarez was interviewed at the CCRB on March 7, 2014 (encl. C33-35). His statement is summarized below.

At approximately 8:59 p.m. on May 15, 2013, PO Tavarez, Lt. Vasquez, and PO Thomas effected a car stop at 1473 Bryant Avenue. PCP was discovered in the course of the ensuing investigation, and all three individuals associated with the vehicle were arrested and brought back to the stationhouse. One of those individuals was § 87(2)(b). PO Tavarez removed § 87(2)(b) from a nearby store, where he approached her and arrested her without help from other officers. § 87(2)(b) flailed her arms to prevent herself from being handcuffed, and PO Tavarez had to pull her out of the store in order to complete the arrest. § 87(2)(b) did not sustain any injuries in the course of the apprehension. PO Tavarez did not transport § 87(2)(b) to the 42nd Precinct stationhouse, and could not say who did. PO Tavarez does not wear glasses.

PO Tavarez did not know when he returned to the 42nd Precinct stationhouse, or if he was there to see § 87(2)(b) be presented at the desk. He had no specific memory of seeing § 87(2)(b) inside the 42nd Precinct stationhouse, and no memory of what role, if any, he played in processing her arrest. He was not there to see her be fingerprinted. He did not remember being present to see § 87(2)(b)'s property, and specifically her jewelry, be taken from her. PO Tavarez did not recall there being any problem with § 87(2)(b) in the holding cells, and did not see or hear of any force being used against

her there. He never heard that § 87(2)(b) had been non-compliant with any part of processing, and neither heard anything about a prisoner being disorderly in the cells on May 15, 2013. PO Tavarez did not kick, punch, or pull on § 87(2)(b) inside the holding cell, and did not see any other officer do so. He never saw he be hit with an asp.

About two weeks after this incident, PO Tavarez saw § 87(2)(b) smoking PCP inside a vehicle. When PO Tavarez approached her, § 87(2)(b) apologized and asked him not to arrest her. PO Tavarez decided not to arrest § 87(2)(b) because she had already finished whatever it was she had been smoking.

Subject Officer: PO GLENDALE PLUAS

- *PO Glendale Pluas is a § 87(2)(b)*
- *PO Pluas worked from 5:30 p.m. on May 15, 2013 to 2:05 a.m. on May 16, 2013. She was assigned to a post at 163 Trinity Avenue with PO Ruiz and PO Silverstein. She was dressed in uniform, and was assigned to a marked van.*

Memo Book

PO Pluas had no memo book entries regarding this incident (encl. C9-11). She noted taking meal at the stationhouse at 8:00 p.m. and resuming patrol at 9:00 p.m. At 10:20 p.m., she refueled at the 48th Precinct. At 10:30 p.m., she was serving administrative duties with Lt. Van Putten, entering UF61s, until the end of her tour at 2:05 a.m.

CCRB Statement

PO Glendale Pluas was interviewed at the CCRB on December 6, 2013 (encl. C13-14). Her statement is summarized below.

PO Pluas had no memory of this incident, and did not recognize § 87(2)(b) in either her CCRB photograph or her arrest photograph. She did not remember playing any role in a prisoner's processing on May 15, 2013. The investigator explained that § 87(2)(b) was arrested on Bryant Avenue for criminal possession of a controlled substance and a switchblade, then processed at the 42nd Precinct stationhouse. The investigator went on to say that § 87(2)(b)'s arresting officer was PO Mauricio Thomas, and that, at some point, § 87(2)(b) refused to cooperate with her arrest processing. PO Pluas recalled none of these details, nor did she remember interacting with PO Thomas on May 15, 2013.

PO Pluas took her meal at the stationhouse at 8:00 p.m. and resumed her post at 163 Trinity Avenue at 9:00 p.m. At 10:20 p.m., she was getting fuel at the 48th Precinct. At 10:30 p.m., she returned to the stationhouse and entered UF61s with the platoon commander until the end of her tour, at 2:05 a.m. PO Pluas did not return to the stationhouse at any point before 10:30 p.m., as far as she could recall. The investigator informed PO Pluas that PO Thompson said he had asked her to help process § 87(2)(b) who was being disorderly, but PO Pluas did not recall this. She did not remember a female being disorderly in the cells while she was in the stationhouse. She did not remember hearing of any problems that had occurred in the course of a prisoner's processing on May 15, 2013.

Witness Officers: LT. DAVID VASQUEZ and PO LESLIE ROSA

- *Lt. David Vasquez is a § 87(2)(b)*
- *PO Leslie Rosa is a § 87(2)(b)*

who is § 87(2)(b)

- On May 15, 2013, Lt. Vasquez worked as the special operations lieutenant in the 42nd Precinct from 2:45 p.m. to 11:30 p.m. He worked in uniform with PO Mauricio Thomas and PO Alverny Tavarez, in unmarked vehicle #618, a gray Ford minivan. On May 15, 2013, PO Rosa worked from 6:00 p.m. to 2:35 a.m. on May 16, 2013, assigned to conditions. She worked alone, was dressed in uniform, and was assigned to a motor vehicle. She did not recall if her vehicle was marked or unmarked.

Memo Book

At 8:59 p.m. on May 15, 2013, Lt. Vasquez noted a car stop at 1473 Bryant Avenue “for being in front of a fire hydrant” (encl. C24-26). At 9:11 p.m., he called for another unit. At 9:15 p.m., he noted having three individuals under arrest by PO Thomas for criminal possession of a controlled substance (PCP) in the vehicle. He then returned to the 42nd Precinct. At 9:20 p.m., Lt. Vasquez noted performing administrative duties in the 42nd Precinct stationhouse. At 11:30 p.m., he went off-duty. PO Leslie Rosa had no memo book entries regarding this incident (encl. C36-37). Her only entries for that day note that she was present for duty at 6:00 p.m., and that she went end of tour at 2:35 a.m.

CCRB Statement

Lt. David Vasquez was interviewed at the CCRB on March 6, 2014 (encl. C28-30), and PO Leslie Rosa on March 21, 2014 (encl. C39-40). Their statements are summarized below.

Lt. Vasquez stated that PO Thomas was the first to approach § 87(2)(b). Lt. Vasquez was on hand to witness that interaction, and said that there was nothing remarkable about § 87(2)(b)'s conduct or demeanor over the course of the arrest; she did not resist, and officers did not have to take steps to “bring her down.” Lt. Vasquez was not sure if he transported any prisoners to the 42nd Precinct stationhouse, but knew he rode back with his two partners. He did not know what other unit would have transported § 87(2)(b) if not his own.

Upon arriving at the 42nd Precinct stationhouse, Lt. Vasquez entered § 87(2)(b)'s arrest into the command log, along with the other two arrests made at Bryant Avenue. Lt. Vasquez was with § 87(2)(b) when she was presented at the desk, where she made no comments beyond stating her pedigree information. Lt. Vasquez stamped her into the command log and logged her into the prisoner holding pen roster. Nothing remarkable occurred during that process. According to Lt. Vasquez, PO Thomas and PO Tavarez were with him when he presented § 87(2)(b) before the desk. After logging § 87(2)(b) into the book, Lt. Vasquez went upstairs to his office on the second floor to do administrative paperwork. Lt. Vasquez never saw § 87(2)(b) again, and had no involvement with any other part of her processing. Lt. Vasquez had nothing to do with fingerprinting § 87(2)(b) and was not there to see her jewelry be forfeited and vouchered. Lt. Vasquez stated that PO Thomas, as the arresting officer, would have been the one to handle those tasks, and PO Tavarez would probably have assisted with paperwork, property vouchers, and the like.

Lt. Vasquez said that if a prisoner had refused to comply with some part of processing, or had been acting disorderly in the cells, he would probably have been notified by one of the officers handling the arrests. He would certainly have been notified if any injuries had been incurred, and an ambulance would have responded. Lt. Vasquez never received such a notification, and no ambulance was called. A supervisor must be notified if force is used on a prisoner in the holding cells, and that supervisor must, in turn, notify the Duty Captain to evaluate the situation. No such notification was ever made, as far as Lt. Vasquez knew.

PO Leslie Rosa had no memory of this incident and did not recognize § 87(2)(b) in the photographs presented to her. She did not remember helping to process any arrests on May 15, 2013, and no memory of any problems or altercations occurring in the holding cell on that day. She had no memory of when she returned to the stationhouse, and did not know if she would have returned much before her

end of tour. PO Rosa acknowledged that she had no memo book entries about any police action she took on May 15, 2013. If she had assisted in the processing of a prisoner, PO Rosa said, she would have noted it in her memo book, though normally she would not process any prisoner that had not been arrested by a member of her team. PO Rosa had no memory of interacting with PO Thomas or PO Pluas on May 15, 2013.

Witness Officers: SGT. RAYMOND CLARKE, SGT. FIDEL ROSARIO, and SGT. FRANNY NUNEZ

- *Sgt. Raymond Clarke is a § 87(2)(b) at the time of this incident. Sgt. Fidel Rosario is a § 87(2)(b). He was § 87(2)(b) old at the time of this incident. Sgt. Franny Nunez is a § 87(2)(b) at the time of this incident.*
- *On May 15, 2013, Sgt. Clarke worked from 2:50 p.m. to 11:47 p.m., assigned to administrative duties as the domestic violence supervisor. He assumed the 42nd Precinct stationhouse desk at 08:15 p.m., and left it at 10:00 p.m. He was dressed in uniform, was working alone, and was not assigned to a motor vehicle. On May 15, 2013, Sgt. Rosario was the patrol supervisor from 2:50 p.m. to 11:47 p.m. At approximately 10:00 p.m. that night, he was working as the desk officer. He had no partner at the desk. He was dressed in uniform, and was not assigned to a motor vehicle. Sgt. Franny Nunez worked from 10:51 p.m. on May 15, 2013 to 8:02 a.m. on May 16, 2013. He was assigned to the desk in the 42nd Precinct stationhouse, dressed in uniform, did not have a partner and was not assigned to a motor vehicle.*

Memo Books

Neither Sgt. Clarke (encl. C15-16), nor Sgt. Rosario (encl. C19-21), nor Sgt. Nunez (encl. C41-43) had any memo book entries regarding this incident.

CCRB Statements

Sgt. Raymond Clarke was interviewed at the CCRB on January 22, 2014 (encl. C17-18). Sgt. Fidel Rosario was interviewed at the CCRB on March 5, 2014 (encl. C22-23), and Sgt. Franny Nunez was interviewed at the CCRB on May 16, 2014 (encl. C44-45). Their statements are summarized below.

None of the three officers assigned to the desk during § 87(2)(b)'s stay at the 42nd Precinct stationhouse recalled the incident, nor did they recognize § 87(2)(b) in the photographs presented. They did not remember a prisoner refusing to be fingerprinted, or refusing to forfeit her jewelry. None of the officers remembered there being any problem in the holding cell on May 15, 2013, and none exerted or witnessed any force against prisoners there.

Sgt. Clarke confirmed that, according to the command log, he was at the desk when § 87(2)(b) was brought into the stationhouse, but also said that the notation of her arrest is not in his handwriting. He pointed out that a lieutenant verified the arrest, and that the lieutenant probably entered her into the command log. It is likely that, if the lieutenant entered the arrest, it was he who completed all the desk officer's typical tasks: verifying the prisoner's name, noting the charges against her, noting whether or not she required medical attention, and removing her "garments." Sgt. Clarke explained that he would have asked the arresting officer to remove the prisoner's shoelaces, belts, or any other strings with which the prisoner might harm herself or others. This can happen either at the desk or in the cells; females, typically, are searched in the holding cells.

Sgt. Clarke explained that if a prisoner refuses to forfeit her property, it must be forcibly removed; a prisoner cannot be sent to Central Booking wearing jewelry, or anything that is sharp or can be sharpened. However, no set procedure governs that situation. The forcible removal of the prisoner's jewelry would most likely occur in the holding cell, rather than in front of the desk. If there is a problem in the holding cell area, it is the desk sergeant's duty to get involved and rectify it. Sgt. Clarke had no memory of any

altercation taking place in the cell that day, nor did he ever hear other officers say that one had taken place.

Sgt. Rosario was shown a copy of the 42nd Precinct command log, and viewed the stamp noting § 87(2)(b)'s arrival at the stationhouse, which he said was not filled out in his handwriting. He noted that he came onto the desk at 10:00 p.m., a little while after § 87(2)(b) first arrived; the notations at and after 10:00 p.m. are in Sgt. Rosario's handwriting. Sgt. Rosario said it was likely § 87(2)(b)'s jewelry was removed before he took up his assignment at the desk, as a prisoner's property is usually taken from her when she first arrives.

Sgt. Nunez had no memory of any prisoners refusing to be fingerprinted on May 15, 2013, and said that, in such cases, procedure requires that the objecting prisoner be designated a high escape-risk and sent to Central Booking in leg-shackles. The flight-risk designation is entered in the prisoner's pedigree sheet, as well as on her Online Booking Sheet. This procedure is not in force when a prisoner refuses to voucher her jewelry, because Central Booking will not accept a prisoner in possession of such items. If a prisoner refuses to forfeit her jewelry, officers will physically remove the jewelry themselves. Only a female officer can physically remove property from the body of a female prisoner. Sgt. Nunez stated that a prisoner's jewelry must be removed before she can be placed in the holding cells; § 87(2)(b) could not have been lodged there while still wearing jewelry, even if only for a moment.

All three desk sergeants confirmed that the female holding cell can be seen from the front desk; Sgt. Rosario placed it about 10 or 15 feet away from the desk officer's position. All three officers confirmed that prisoners cannot be sent to Central Booking wearing jewelry, and all three stated that a prisoner's jewelry is typically taken from them when they first arrive at the command. None remembered having specific interactions with PO Thomas on May 15, 2013.

NYPD Documents

Command Log

As per the 42nd Precinct Command Log on May 15, 2013, Sgt. Raymond Clark assumed the desk at 8:15 p.m. (encl. D5-13). The time at which § 87(2)(b)'s arrest was noted is cut off in the investigator's copy of the command log, but both § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were entered into the book at 9:25 p.m. All three entries are in the same handwriting, all three arrests are credited to PO Thomas, and all three were approved by Lt. Vasquez. § 87(2)(b)'s physical and mental condition is described as apparently normal, and no "personal property" was removed. She was removed to Central Booking at 2:56 a.m. At 10:00 p.m., Sgt. Rosario assumed the desk. At 10:51 p.m., Sgt. Nunez was present for duty. At 11:05 p.m., he assumed the desk, and remained there until the beginning of Tour 2, on May 16, 2013.

Roll Call

As per the 42nd Precinct Roll Call on May 15, 2013, there were eight females on duty, only three of whom are Hispanic: PO Glendale Pluas, PO Leslie Rosa, and PO Daliza Matoslugo (encl. D20-28). PO Matoslugo is dark-skinned, while PO Pluas and PO Rosa are medium to light-skinned. No females were assigned to work Tour 1 on May 16, 2013, as per the next day's roll call (encl. D29-34).

Medical Treatment of Prisoner Report

As per the 42nd Precinct ICO, no MTPR was prepared for § 87(2)(b) (encl. H1).

§ 87(2)(b)

Status of Civil Proceedings

- As of June 6, 2014, § 87(2)(b) has not filed a Notice of Claim with the Office of the New York City Comptroller (encl. E1).

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(c) (impair contract awards or CRA)

§ 87(2)(b)

Officer CCRB History

- PO Mauricio Thomas has been a member of service for six years, and there are no substantiated CCRB complaints against him (encl. A1).
- PO Alverny Tavarez has been a member of service for five years, and there are no substantiated CCRB complaints against him (encl. A2).
- PO Glendale Pluas has been a member of service for twelve years, and there are no substantiated CCRB complaints against him (encl. A3).

Conclusion

Identification of Subject Officers

§ 87(2)(b) said that one of the officers who struck her in the holding cell explicitly identified himself as her arresting officer. § 87(2)(b) described him as a dark-skinned Hispanic male who § 87(2)(b) thought was Dominican, about 5'9" tall with a medium build and close-cropped hair. He appeared to be in his thirties, and was dressed in uniform. PO Mauricio Thomas acknowledged being § 87(2)(b)'s arresting officer, and acknowledged being involved, to some degree, in her arrest processing at the 42nd Precinct stationhouse. He is a § 87(2)(b) old Hispanic male with black hair and brown eyes, who is 5'10" tall and 220 pounds. He was dressed in uniform during this incident, and his NYPD pedigree photograph shows him to be dark-skinned. Based on his physical appearance and his acknowledged role in processing § 87(2)(b) Allegations A and D have been pled against PO Thomas.

In her initial phone statement to the CCRB, § 87(2)(b) stated she was assaulted in the holding cell of the 42nd Precinct stationhouse by a total of six officers; in her official statement, she said she was beaten by four. § 87(2)(b) implicated PO Thomas in both narratives, though her two accounts of his actions were widely discrepant, as will be discussed below. The other male officer who hit § 87(2)(b) was described as a uniformed Hispanic with black hair. He was about 5'7" tall and 150 or 160 pounds, with a muscular build; he appeared to be about 30 years old, and had glasses with black frames. He was among the three Hispanic males who drove § 87(2)(b) from the scene of the arrest to the stationhouse, along with PO Thomas, who was sitting next to her in the backseat. § 87(2)(b) saw this officer again two days later, when he stopped her in her vehicle.

The three officers who had responsibility for § 87(2)(b)'s arrest, PO Thomas, PO Alverny Tavarez, and Lt. David Vasquez, are all Hispanic males, and were all working together in one vehicle. PO Thomas and Lt. Vasquez confirmed that the three officers drove back to the stationhouse together. However, they all insisted that they did not transport § 87(2)(b) back to the 42nd Precinct stationhouse (they could not agree on whether or not they transported any prisoners at all), and could not identify the officers who did. PO Tavarez, at § 87(2)(b) age, 215 pounds, and 5'9" tall, does not fit the description of particularly well, and does not wear glasses. He is, however, a Hispanic male with black

hair, and he did acknowledge stopping § 87(2)(b) in a vehicle sometime after this incident. PO Tavaréz had no memory of any actions he took with respect to § 87(2)(b) in the 42nd Precinct stationhouse, and no memory of even seeing her there. Though no documentation could establish whether or not he was in the stationhouse while § 87(2)(b) was being processed, PO Thomas and Lt. Vasquez both said that he was. Lt. Vasquez, at § 87(2)(b) of age, 5'10" tall and 174 pounds, is not a particularly good fit for the officer § 87(2)(b) described; though he does not wear glasses, he does have black hair, and he was the officer who entered § 87(2)(b)'s arrest into the command log. Sgt. Rosario, the desk officer at the time, did not remember § 87(2)(b) but he indicated that the officer to enter her name in the book would likely have been the one to remove her property. Lt. Vasquez stated that § 87(2)(b) was standing with him when he entered her name into the log, as was PO Thomas and PO Tavaréz; those officers took over her processing, and Lt. Vasquez went upstairs to his office. Lt. Vasquez did not see § 87(2)(b)'s property be taken from her, but said that tasks like that would almost certainly have been performed by the arresting officer and his partner, PO Tavaréz. Given these facts (that Lt. Vasquez had responsibility for § 87(2)(b) when she was presented before the desk, which is the point at which most of the interviewed officers said her jewelry would have been taken from her, and that PO Tavaréz was there to assume responsibility for her when Lt. Vasquez left), the likelihood that the second male subject officer is either PO Tavaréz or Lt. Vasquez is high. PO Tavaréz's acknowledged stop of § 87(2)(b) in her vehicle, which occurred sometime after the incident and is consonant with an allegation she made against the second subject male, strongly suggests that § 87(2)(b) intended to attach her allegations of force to him. Though § 87(2)(b) did not cooperate with attempts to schedule a photo viewing, the evidence suggesting that PO Tavaréz is the second subject male officer (his broad match to the description, § 87(2)(g))

Therefore, Allegation B is pled against PO Tavaréz.

§ 87(2)(b) consistently described one of the female officers who hit her in the 42nd Precinct holding cell as a medium-complexioned Hispanic female in her thirties, who was "heavysset," at 170 to 180 pounds and 5'7" tall. She was dressed in uniform and her dark brown hair was pulled back in a ponytail. However, § 87(2)(b)'s descriptions of the other female officer who hit her in the holding cell, PO3, varied widely; in her initial statement to the CCRB, § 87(2)(b) stated that PO3 was a skinny white woman with blond hair. In her official interview, § 87(2)(b) described her as a short and skinny Hispanic woman with black hair, who was older and a little darker than her partner. She was in her forties, about 5'5" tall, and 120 pounds.

There were two medium- to light-skinned Hispanic females on duty in the 42nd Precinct on May 15, 2013, PO Leslie Rosa and PO Glendale Pluas. PO Thomas stated that PO Glendale Pluas coaxed § 87(2)(b) out of the holding cell and fingerprinted her; § 87(2)(b) was verbally protesting throughout that process, but PO Pluas ultimately did not use any physical force to complete it. PO Thomas was unaware of any dispute involving § 87(2)(b)'s jewelry, and had no memory of the moment it was taken from her. PO Pluas is a Hispanic female with black hair and a medium-brown complexion. She is 5'8" tall and 190 pounds, and her NYPD pedigree sheet describes her build as "heavy." Her hair in that record is described as red; at the time of her CCRB interview, PO Pluas's hair was black. PO Pluas had no memory of § 87(2)(b) and no memory of assisting any officer in processing their prisoner on May 15, 2013. PO Pluas's memo book, though, established that she was back in the stationhouse performing administrative duties by 10:30 p.m., making it likely that she was at least in the building when § 87(2)(b) was fingerprinted. PO Rosa's whereabouts during § 87(2)(b)'s stay in the 42nd Precinct could not be established; she had no memo book entries regarding anything she did on May 15, 2013, nor did she note when she returned to the command on that day. PO Rosa is a Hispanic female who is 5'2" tall and 160 pounds. She is fair-skinned and has brown hair. PO Rosa did not recognize § 87(2)(b) either, and did not remember helping another officer to process a prisoner on May 15, 2013.

PO Pluas is a fairly close match to § 87(2)(b)'s description of the "heavyset" female officer; her height, weight, build, and complexion are all consonant with § 87(2)(b)'s assessment, and her NYPD pedigree sheet suggests that her hair-color varies. She is the only female officer whom the evidence links to § 87(2)(b) as PO Thomas stated he saw PO Pluas convince § 87(2)(b) to leave the holding cell and then fingerprint her. It is perhaps for this reason that § 87(2)(b)'s description of the heavyset officer remained fairly consistent in both her statements. That description, taken in conjunction with PO Pluas's memo book placing her on the scene at the time of incident, and PO Thomas's statement linking her to it, was enough to plead § 87(2)(b)'s allegation of Force against her. Therefore, Allegation C is pled against PO Pluas.

Very little evidence can be brought to bear on the identification on PO3, who was first described as a white woman with blond hair and, a month and a half later, described as a medium-complexioned Hispanic female with black hair. It is possible that § 87(2)(b) was confused about the second female officer who hit her; it is also possible that no second female assaulted § 87(2)(b) in the course of an incident that, by all other accounts, did not happen. The investigation was unable to come to conclusive findings in this matter, as will be discussed below. Likewise, the description of PO3 was too broad and too variable to attach to any one officer. § 87(2)(b) did not cooperate with attempts to arrange a photo viewing, and no police documentation or credible witness testimony could establish who participated in the incident, or indeed if it ever occurred. Therefore, Allegation E is pled against an officer.

Investigative Findings and Recommendations

- **Allegation A – Force: PO Mauricio Thomas used physical force against § 87(2)(b)**
- **Allegation B – Force: PO Alverny Tavarez used physical force against § 87(2)(b)**
- **Allegation C – Force: PO Glendale Pluas used physical force against § 87(2)(b)**

In her official CCRB interview on June 26, 2013, § 87(2)(b) alleged that, on May 15, 2013, she was scratched, pulled, punched, and kicked by PO Thomas, PO Pluas, PO Tavarez and one other female the 42nd Precinct stationhouse. § 87(2)(b)'s legs were shackled and her hands were cuffed in front of her as she sat on a bench in the cell, hunched over to protect herself from the officers' blows, and to prevent them from grabbing her jewelry. When PO Pluas pulled her head up by the hair, § 87(2)(b) was able to see PO Tavarez kick her in the back. PO Thomas also hit § 87(2)(b) with an asp, at which point she fell to the floor and went limp. In her initial phone-statement to the CCRB, made on May 17, 2013, two days after the incident, § 87(2)(b) stated that PO Thomas held her down on the ground by her handcuffs and pulled her hair; she did not, at that time, state that PO Thomas kicked her, punched her, or hit her with an asp. Throughout that first statement, § 87(2)(b) seemed more inclined to describe the force as "pulling" and "touching," adding only later that two female officers had also hit her.

PO Thomas denied using any force against § 87(2)(b) in the stationhouse, and said that the only time he entered § 87(2)(b)'s cell was to hand her the voucher for her property at the end of the night. Neither he nor PO Tavarez remembered when or how § 87(2)(b)'s jewelry was obtained, and neither remembered § 87(2)(b) ever refusing to forfeit her property. PO Thomas did remember that § 87(2)(b) was vocal and hostile throughout the evening, verbally abusing him from the holding cells and claiming he had hit her. According to PO Thomas, § 87(2)(b) did, at some point, refuse to be fingerprinted; § 87(2)(b) herself, corroborated this. PO Thomas stated that, when confronted with a combative female prisoner, it is his practice not to engage her. On this occasion, he said he asked PO Glendale Pluas to convince § 87(2)(b) to submit to a fingerprinting while he stood back and did nothing. PO Pluas was then able to fingerprint § 87(2)(b) without incident. PO Pluas did not recall § 87(2)(b) and could not corroborate PO Thomas's statement. Neither she nor PO Tavarez remembered dealing with § 87(2)(b) or even seeing her, in the 42nd Precinct stationhouse.

§ 87(2)(b)'s cousin, § 87(2)(b) and nephew, § 87(2)(b) confirmed that they were

in the adjacent holding cell when the alleged force occurred. § 87(2)(b) who ultimately did not cooperate with the investigation, described seeing § 87(2)(b) being beaten in the holding cell while rear-cuffed on the ground. § 87(2)(b) though, stated that there was no way to see into the women's holding cell from the men's side. He initially said that nothing unusual happened to his aunt at the 42nd Precinct, but later said that officers had "beat her up" and "grabbed" her in an attempt to obtain her jewelry. He heard § 87(2)(b) screaming, but saw nothing of what happened to her.

None of the three officers who manned the front desk while § 87(2)(b) was in the holding cell at the 42nd Precinct stationhouse (from 9:25 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. on May 16, 2013) recalled this incident. None remembered witnessing any force in the holding cell on May 15, 2013, or there being any problems with prisoners that day. None recognized § 87(2)(b) in the photograph presented. All of them stated that the women's holding cell is visible from their position at the desk, and all confirmed that they should have been notified of any force officers exerted on prisoners. PO Tavarez and Lt. Vasquez, PO Thomas's partners, did not recall there being any trouble with § 87(2)(b)'s arrest processing; Lt. Vasquez confirmed that he would have, or should have, been notified if there had been. The command log does not note any force having been exerted in the holding cell, and no medical treatment of prisoner report was prepared. Though § 87(2)(b) alleged that she was hit in the face and incurred marks there, no such marks appear in her arrest photograph. § 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

All of the interviewed officers said that the forfeiture of property is typically one of the first things to occur upon a prisoner's arrival at the stationhouse. Sgt. Nunez went so far as to say that a prisoner may not be lodged in the holding cells, even for a moment, while wearing jewelry, on account of the danger these items pose when wielded with malicious intent. § 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

- **Allegation D – Force: PO Mauricio Thomas struck § 87(2)(b) with an asp.**

In her official CCRB statement, § 87(2)(b) stated that PO Thomas struck her on the back with an asp, causing her to fall to the ground and go limp. In her initial phone-statement on May 17, 2013, § 87(2)(b) mentioned nothing about being hit with asp, saying only that six officers grabbed her, scratched her, and pulled on her in an attempt to obtain her jewelry, and that two female officers hit her with their fists. At that time, the only allegations she made against PO Thomas were that he pulled her hair and held her by the handcuffs. PO Thomas denied ever hitting § 87(2)(b) with an asp, and all the other officers interviewed denied seeing him do so. Lt. Vasquez and the three desk officers insisted that they would almost certainly have been notified if force of such magnitude had been used, and Lt. Vasquez went on to describe the various other notifications he would have been required to make in turn (to a Duty Captain, for one, and to an ambulance). § 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

- **Allegation E – Force: Officers used physical force against** § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) alleged that she was scratched, pulled, hit and kicked, by PO Thomas, PO Tavarez, PO Pluas, and one other female officer inside the 42nd Precinct stationhouse. § 87(2)(g)

Team: _____

Investigator: _____
Signature Print Date

Supervisor: _____
Title/Signature Print Date

Reviewer: _____
Title/Signature Print Date

Reviewer: _____
Title/Signature Print Date